

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on November 5, 2004, and the references cited therewith. This amendment cancels no claims, amends no claims, and adds no new claims. As a result, claim 18-27 remain pending in the application.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 314 (figure 3).

Applicant includes with this amendment and response a clean copy of Sheet 2, labeled as, "REPLACEMENT SHEET" which incorporates the suggested corrections to Figure 3. Specifically, the reference character "314" has been deleted from Figure 3. The submitted drawing, including the suggested corrections, bring the drawings into compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

In the Specification

In the Specification, the matters noted in the Office Action have been corrected. Specifically, the status of the copending application has been updated to reflect that the copending application is "now issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,666,927 B2." In addition, the phrase "90_" as been replaced by the phrase "90°" in the specification in four places: page 2 at line 31, and on page 3 at lines 12, 15, and 16.

In addition, although not included in the Office Action, Applicant has also, on page 2 at line 4, replaced the phrase "100_m" with the phrase "100 μ m" in order to correct this informality.

No new matter is believed proposed. Applicant submits that the Specification is now in proper condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the Specification.

IN THE DRAWING

A corrected drawing is supplied herewith. Sheet 2 is identified as "REPLACEMENT SHEET," on which Figure 3 has been amended to delete the reference character "314."

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 18-20 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by The Admitted State of the Prior Art, as set forth on pages 2-3, figures 1-2 of specification (hereafter ASPA).

Claim 18 recites, "a single opening formed in the vacuum tube at a selected location." Claim 24 recites, "forming a single opening in the at least one vacuum tube at a selected location." This language distinguishes the admitted prior art, which has "A plurality of holes 115 are formed in the vacuum tube 106 around the perimeter of the exposure slit 104. The tube 106 may have from about 20 to about 56 holes 115 formed therein to draw away outgassed particles from the resist material," as described in the Specification at page 3, lines 2-5. Claims 19-20 depend from claim 18, and thus incorporate all the recitations of claim 18. Claims 25-26 depend from claim 24, and thus incorporate all the recitations of claim 24. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 18-20 and 24-26.

Claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 24-26.

Claim 24 recites, "forming a single opening in the at least one vacuum tube at a selected location to cause air flow away from an element of *an integrated circuit manufacturing device*." (emphasis added) In contrast, Johnson, in the abstract states, "A method of manufacturing *an electrical connector housing* for mounting a plurality of connector elements." (emphasis added) Further, the phrase "integrated circuit manufacturing device" does not even appear in Johnson. Hence, Johnson fails to teach each of the elements recited in claim 24. Claims 25-26 depend from claim 24, and thus incorporate all the recitations of claim 24. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 24-26.

Claims 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawasaki. Applicant disagrees that Kawasaki is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Under § 102(b) "A person shall be entitled to a patent unless - (b) the invention was patented or described in a

printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, *more than one year prior to the date of application* for patent in the United States." (emphasis added).

The present application claims priority to Patent Application Serial No. 09/845,842, filed April 30, 2001. Therefore, one year prior to the filing date for the application is April 30, 2000.

Kawasaki issued on May 9, 2000, and so was not patented or described in a printed publication more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Therefore, the rejection of claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is improper, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 24-25.

Assuming, but not admitting it to be so, that Kawasaki is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Applicant submits the following response.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 24-25. As noted above, claim 24 recites, "forming a single opening in the at least one *vacuum tube* at a *selected location*." (emphasis added) In contrast, Kawasaki at column 3, lines 19-20, states "The exhaust trap 5 has an intake port 5a wider than the outer diameter of the semiconductor wafer 1." Therefore, Kawasaki fails to teach "forming a single opening in the at least one vacuum tube at a selected location," and so fails to teach each of the elements recited in claim 24. Claim 25 depends from claim 24, and thus incorporate all the recitations of claim 24. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration and allowance of claims 24-25.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 21-23 and 27 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant acknowledges the indication of allowability of claims 21-23 and 27, if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. However, Applicant has not amended claims 21-23 and 27 to place them in independent form at this time. Pursuant to the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Documents Cited but Not Relied Upon for this Office Action

Applicant has reviewed the cited references that were not applied to the claims, and agrees that the claims distinguish over them in a patentable manner.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 10/692,881

Filing Date: October 24, 2003

Title: VACUUM DEBRIS REMOVAL SYSTEM FOR AN INTEGRATED CIRCUIT MANUFACTURING DEVICE

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 12

Dkt: 884.422US2 (INTEL)

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6971) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted;

SHARONE GINDEL

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Attorneys for Intel Corporation

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

(612) 373-6971

Date 5 JAN 2005

By

J. Michael Anglin

Reg. No. 24,916

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 5th day of January, 2005.

Amy Moriarty

Name

[Signature]

Signature